DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 348 PS 009 995

AUTHOR Heinicke, Christoph M.; Strassmann, Larry H.
TITLE The Effects of Day Care on Preschoolers and the Provision of Support Services for Day Care Families.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington., D.C. Office of the Secretary.
PUB DATE 15 Jul 77
NOTE 42p.; For related documents, see ED 149 861 and PS 009 986 - PS 010 006 ; Reproduced from the best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Development; *Day Care Services; Early Childhood Education; Educational Improvement; Educational Quality; *Literature Reviews; *Parent Child Relationship; Parent Education; Peer Relationship; Quality of Life; *Social Work; Social Workers; *State Licensing Boards

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on aspects of the day care experience of the preschooler which might be changed through licensing revisions in an attempt to improve the developmental potential of the child and his or her family. Section I reviews research examining the effects of the typical day care experience on the immediate and long-term development of the preschool child and family. While long-term effects cannot be reliably determined due to a lack of evidence, studies of short-term effects do not exhibit either a positive or a negative effect. Short term effects are documented through an analysis of developmental variables such as intellectual development, relationship to peers, task orientation, modulation of aggression, and the ability to make the transition from the primary caretaker to new relationships. Section II reviews research pertaining to the influence of parent-child interaction on the child's day care experience, and emphasizes steps which can be taken to promote the quality of that parent-child interaction. Three forms of family intervention are discussed: (a) training to promote mother-child verbal interaction around a cognitively stimulating task, (b) a social work approach to promote the competence of the parent as a parent and as a person, and (c) various parent education efforts. The social work approach is further examined in the context of day care, and licensing revisions which facilitate the availability of such family services are suggested. Finally, four functions of social workers involved in day care services are outlined. (Author/CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

7/15/77

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE EFFECTS OF DAY CARE ON PRESCHOOLERS AND THE PROVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES FOR DAY CARE FAMILIES

ED156348

by

Christoph M. Heinicke, Ph.D.

and

Larry M. Strassmann, Ph.D.

Department of Psychiatry and
Bio-Behavioral Sciences, U.C.L.A.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William R. Prosser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PS009995

This paper addresses the question of what aspects of the day care experience of the preschooler can possibly be changed through licensing revisions in order to improve the developmental potential of the child and his or her family. We will break this down into three further questions: First, we will ask what effects does the typical day care experience have on the immediate and long-term development of the child and family? Anticipating our conclusion, it will be noted that the evidence on the long-term effects of day care is practically non-existent, and such adequate studies of the short-term effects as exist, do not indicate an overwhelming

documentation of either a positive or negative effect. That day care exerts no "hammer" effect on the preschoolers is an important conclusion. Moreover, certain of the results suggest important further research. More important, our own analysis indicates that efforts to evaluate a global entity called "the day care experience of the pre-schooler" is not a fruitful approach. It is like asking: Does Head Start or Psychotherapy do any good? Instead, we need to ask: What combination of factors or particular factors enhance the child's and family's day care experience?

There is much research evidence to indicate that the nature of the parent-child and child-parent interaction is a critical influence on both the development of the child and family (Heinicke, 1977a). It seems most likely then that variations in the quality of this interaction have a critical influence on the nature of the day care experience. This reasoning leads to our second and third general questions, which are: What evidence is there that the quality of the parent-child interaction does influence the preschool child's day care experience, and what modes of bringing about changes in the parent-child interaction can be suggested in the context of the delivery and thus licensing of day care services.

We turn then to our first question: What effects does the typical day care experience have on the immediate and long-term development of the child and family?

I. THE EFFECTS OF DAY CARE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRESCHOOL CHILD AND FAMILY.

Despite the considerable attention which has been focused on day care in recent years, there has been relatively little research which has delineated the developmental effects on the child of day care per se. We know of no such research in the area of family day care. Moreover, the research which does exist tends to focus on the immediate impact of day care on the child. Longitudinal studies of the type which would be necessary to assess whether stable internalized changes have been wrought in the child and family, are largely unavailable. People concerned with the planning of day care have typically asked whether any negative developmental consequences occur because of a child's placement in day care and/or whether there exist positive benefits accruing from such an experience. With the exception of one study which will be discussed shortly, there has so far been no substantiation for the concerns voiced by certain people regarding the possible negative repercussions of separation and day care placement of the preschool child. There is, however, some evidence that indicates that the preschool child who has been in center-day care since infancy is not developing as well as his home-reared counterpart, and this evidence will be cited below. Moreover, we feel that the concerns regarding quality of care should not be silenced. It is our impression that the least adequate programs are not likely to permit a research involvement and consequently one is even less able to comment on the possible repercussions of a child being cared for in a "non-optimal" day care program.

In addition to the reservations already cited, namely, an absence of

research in general and longitudinal research in particular, other limitations to reaching viable conclusions exist. Thus, much of the thinking regarding day care has been based on nursery-school and preschool research (e.g., witness the 1973 report on Federal programs for young children (White et al., 1973), and it is important to stress the inherent dangers in generalizing these findings (which typically involve a half-day program for the children) to the issue of all-day day care. Studies of individual children (Heinicke, Busch, Click and Kramer, 1973) and some group comparisons (Heinicke, 1956) indicate that the experience of the 3 year-old being separated from the mother for a full 8 hour day is likely to be different from the experience of a child who only goes to nursery school in the morning.

The research findings on the impact of day care that do exist, are usefully organized in terms of a number of child development indices or variables. Assessment of the preschool day care child has suggested one cluster of such variables labeled: Adaptation-Competence (Heinicke, 1977b). Several areas of development make up (are loaded on) this cluster of behavior: I.Q., capacity for peer relationships, task orientation, the ability to move from the relationship to the primary caretaker to new relationships, and the ability to modulate aggression. This cluster then suggests a variety of important areas of development that should be examined.

In our review of the research literature, we shall distinguish those findings on preschoolers who are entering day care at that point, and those preschoolers who have been in day care for a considerable period before the age of three.

A. I.Q.

Looking first at studies of preschool children who had not been in previous day care, two studies have reported long-term results on the impact of day care on the 3 - 5 year-old child (Caldwell, 1969, and Cisin, 1970). The results of these studies showed a similar pattern regarding cognitive development to that of the Head Start and other experimental intervention programs in that the I.Q. scores of the children from low-income backgrounds who had participated in the day care center programs increased significantly more than did the control groups without the day care experiences; however, they also decreased again after termination of the special program.

Another research effort in a related vein by Robinson and Robinson (1971) also shows day care children to have improved significantly more intellectually than their controls; however, again, the lack of follow-up data prevents one from reaching any conclusions about the stability of the gains made. This was also the case for the findings of Prentiss and Bieri (1970), who demonstrated that children in day care improved in I.Q.; however, in this study not only was there no follow-up but no control group to help one in clarifying the meaning of the findings. Additionally, a day care control group in the Heinicke et al. (1976) research also found that after a two-year period the children's I.Q.'s were essentially the same as at entry. However, the specific meaning of this finding is difficult to assess since the sample is in effect a self-selected one consisting of those children who did not drop out of the program and therefore may represent a "healthier,"

more stable population than those who left. Featherstone (1973) also found cognitive improvements (using the Pre-School Inventory and the Stanford Binet) in day care children on a short-term basis but again without the follow-up material to indicate whether stabilized changes had occurred. Thus, the Caldwell (1969), Cisin (1970), and control group of the Heinicke et al. (1976) research would presently suggest that, as with special intervention efforts (see Bronfenbrenner review, 1974) for disadvantaged children, participation in these day care programs may lead to initial cognitive gains but these gains are not sustained.

Four studies of preschool children deal with samples who had begun day care during the first year of life. Two studies deal with samples originally studied by Caldwell et al. (1970). These children were predominantly from "lower class" families and were clinically and subjectively seen as "disadvantaged." The programs had generous adult-child ratios (1:4 approximately) and stressed factors such as sensitivity to the child's needs and the general competence of the adults. Most children attended for a full 6 to 9 hour day and the classroom activities balanced teacher and child initiated activities. Sensitivity to early social and emotional development was accompanied by cognitive stimulation involving exposure to new experiences and minimum restriction of exploratory moves on the part of the children. In the research by Schwartz et al. (1974), day care preschool children when compared with those that stayed home with their parents did not differ on variables such as problem-solving, ability to abstract, and playfulness. In another study (Lally, et al. 1971) on the same (or overlapping) Caldwell (1970) sample, no differences were found on such measures as I.Q. Fowler

and Khan (1974) found essentially no difference in the Stanford-Binet I.Q. at age five, between eleven matched pairs of day-care and home-reared middle class children three years after the former had graduated from an "enriched" program in which they had been enrolled during the first two years of life. Similarly, Keister (1971) reported no significant differences on the Bayley Developmental Scales or the Stanford Binet I.Q. when matched pairs of pre-school children who had been raised in either her exemplary day care program or at home, were compared on these test scores.

While the results on the effects of day care on I.Q. are thus essentially negative, all the previous reservations, and especially those regarding the lack of follow-up must be considered.

B. Relationship to Peers.

Several studies report that children who have been in day care prior to age three, exhibited a higher level of peer interaction when entering a different day care center than those children who were without prior day care experience (Schwartz et al., 1973). This same study of children in day care since 9 months showed they also tended to be less tense in the group setting than the controls who had not experienced group care. Greater social ease may, of course, reflect the greater group experience without necessarily indicating a greater capacity to form lasting peer relationships. This interpretation is supported by the finding that these same children who showed considerable social ease also showed more aggression towards their peers and adults. In evaluating these results, it must however be noted that the children who had not experienced group care came from rather varied

backgrounds (e.g. babysitting care, foster home) and consequently the meaning of the results is less clear than it otherwise might be.

C. The Transition from the Relationship to the Primary Caretaker to New Relationships in the Day Care Center.

In the Schwartz et al. (1973) studies just cited, no evidence was found that those children who had experienced infant day care, felt less secure in adjusting to a new day care center at age 3. Other studies, Schwartz and Wynn (1971), Caldwell et al., (1970), Keister (1971) and Cochran (1974) found no significant differences in preschoolers who had been in day care most of their lives and those who had not, on such indices pertaining to the nature of the relationship as "crying" and "following" at points of separation and reunion.

One study of children who had not been in day care in infancy (Blehar, 1974), did find differential behaviors in the day-care as opposed to home-reared children with respect to issues of separation. Thus, for example, 40-month old day care children cried significantly more than home-reared children at the point of separation from their parents. They also showed other indications of potential difficulties relating to being separated from their mother: Confronted with a stranger in an experimental setting, they cried more, showed more oral behavior and avoided the stranger. When reunited with mother, they exhibited more avoidant behaviors than the home-reared children.

It can be questioned whether the stranger situation used in this research is a sufficiently valid sample of the relationship experiences of

the child. Availability of other indices of the mother-child and child-caretaker relationship could clarify this matter and the authors themselves note that the parents of the home-reared and day-care children may have differed on dimensions which they were unable to isolate. Moreover, follow-up assessments are so far not available so that one cannot determine whether the differences found have long-run developmental consequences. Whatever the ultimate interpretation of these results, Blehar's (1974) study does suggest that there may well be differences between children in day care and those living at home in terms of the ease with which a transition to a strange adult is made.

D. Task Orientation and the Modulation of Aggression.

When dealing with the impact on the child's development of a global variable like day care, it is important to look at a variety of child and parent behaviors in tracing that impact. Without being overwhelming, certain developmental trends may be very significant in the long run. The study by Schwartz et al., (1974) is particularly illuminating in this regard. Their data consists of ratings of 19 matched pairs of three to four-year olds, on nine behavior scales four months after the children had been enrolled in a new day care center, and again four months later. This was the first group care experienced by the "home-reared" youngsters, whereas the other children had been in group care at another center since about nine months of age.

The two groups differed significantly on three of the nine scales. Most markedly, children who had been in day care since 9 months exceeded their previously home-reared counterparts in aggression, both physical and verbal, whether toward peers or adults. They were also less cooperative

in relation to grown-ups and engaged in more running about as against sitting in one place.

Moore (1964) also found that children who had experienced substitute care before age five were significantly more assertive, but less conforming, less impressed by punishment, less averse to dirt, and more prone to toilet lapses than a home care group equated on a number of demographic variables. These findings again suggest less adequate internalized controls in the children who had, by preschool, been in day care since early in their lives. Similarly, Raph et al, (1968) found that negative interactions toward teachers (but not peers) varies directly with the amount of prior exposure to group experience in nursery and kindergarten (ranging from one to three years).

These studies, then, and particularly the one reported by Schwartz et al., (1974) do suggest that at the point of beginning preschool (roughly age 3), children who have had extensive previous day care experiences going back as far as the first year of life, may be able to make quick and easy contacts with peers, but may also show a less adequate development in such areas as aggression modulation and task orientation. As already indicated and as will be further documented shortly (Heinicke, 1977b), the ability to modulate aggression and an adaptive task orientation tend to be correlated with measures of the child's ability to make the transition to new relationships with adults and peers and this cluster of child variables tends in turn to be correlated with measures describing the quality of the parent-child interaction. This raises the question of whether it is the child's stay in day care

which is the crucial variable or whether parent-child influences associated with that variable are the critical determinants of differences found between the day-care and home-reared children.

These methodological reservations in regard to the Schwartz et al., (1974) study can be further discussed in relation to the adequacy of their case for case matching between the early day care and home care groups which only included pairing for age, sex, race and parental occupation and education. Other extremely important variables were not taken into consideration. The infant day care group examined by Schwartz et al., (1974) had initially been studied during earlier years by Caldwell et al., (1970) at which time it was found that potentially relevant differences appeared in contrast to a group of home-reared children with whom they were compared. Of greatest import was the finding that these day-care mothers were less intensely affectionate and more controlling (i.e. less permissive) than home-care mothers. Such findings raise the question of whether those mothers who chose to place their children in day care at an early age were actually less emotionally caring of their children in the first place. Apparently, Schwartz et al., (1974) did not control for such variables, nor did they equate for intellectual or developmental levels between their daycare and home-care groups. This latter element takes on particular significance because in the original Caldwell research effort, it was found that the early day-care group of infants was both significantly lower in their developmental quotient at 12 months and more disadvantaged on their "stimulation inventory scores" than the first home-care group with which they were initially

contrasted. To further compound the uncertainty surrounding the meaning of the Schwartz et al. (1974) findings, one must again note that the new day-care group which had been reared at home until they entered day care in preschool was, to use the author's words, "far more heterogeneous in their prior rearing conditions." Thus, at the time this new group entered day care, 11 were being cared for at home by members of the immediate family (apparently not necessarily by their mothers), 3 had baby-sitters at home while mother worked, and 4 were cared for in the homes of neighbors while mother worked. All of the above stresses then the importance of carefully assessing the parent-child factors that are associated with whatever day-care or home-care arrangement is being studied or compared (i.e. factors such as degree of parental affection, exposure to new experiences, consistency of availability, etc.).

This brings us to a general methodological point in the pursuit of research on the effects of day care. Day care is not a unitary phenomena, and ways must be found of describing variations in the total conditions under which a child is cared for. The following have been recognized as potentially significant aspects of the day care experience and are discussed elsewhere in this volume: The physical arrangements, the staff to child ratio, the nature of the parent participation, the nature of the "curriculum," the type of age grouping, whether the day care structure is open or closed, and the personality and experience of the director and teachers.

In addition to specifying the various components of the child's day care experience, it is essential to study how these various components may be interacting to produce a particular effect. We have already suggested in

our review of previous research that the type of child care arrangement chosen by a parent including for example, whether to place the child in infant day care is likely to be associated with certain characteristics and values of the parent and these in turn have a direct impact on the child's development.

Similarly, research cited below shows that in considering the effect of the type of center day-care structure (open or closed) and the nature of the age groupings used, one has to consider whether a certain type of teacher is drawn to particular variations of structure or group arrangement. Thus, Prescott et al., (1973) examined the effects of what they referred to as open and closed structured centers. As they defined it, the essence of the open and closed center concept was determined by whether the teachers at a respective center felt that they should make most of the choices for the children in contrast to the open mode in which it was felt important for the child to choose his activities. They found that it was the difference in program structure that provided the most powerful predictor of differences in the children's behavior rather than age, sex, and judgements as to whether children were viewed as "thrivers." Observations of the children's behavior revealed closed setting children being significantly higher on items such as "obeys," "gives stereotyped response," "responds to questions." By contrast, the open-setting children were higher on a number of task-oriented dimensions and the degree of physical activity. In general, the closed settings seemed to evoke much behavior in response to external demands with the adults also appearing in these settings to exert demands and to evoke more tension from the children. It is our

opinion that the behavioral characteristics of each of these groups described points to the open center children being more "open and free" in their initiating responses and the closed setting children being more geared towards listening to what they were told to do and behaving properly. This constellation of behaviors suggests that desirable qualities such as spontaneity and creativity might well be more commonly anticipated from the children coming from an open setting. On the basis of their findings, the authors noted that a program heavily concentrated on either the open or closed end of the continuum relative to structure, might well fail to provide an optimally productive environment for certain children. They suggest that a closed structure seemed especially pressureful for actively involved children, frustrated children, and non-adjusted children, while an open structure, unless it provides amply for privacy and adult support, might overly stimulate and confuse the diffuse child, the socially timid child and the cautious child. Importantly, the authors also indicate that the teachers in the closed settings were less likely to be warm and sensitive and the children less likely to be involved, except where the task was well suited to their interests and competence. It would seem then that a certain type of teacher is drawn to a certain type of structure and will quite apart from the structure have a direct effect on the child.

In a related vein of comparing center characteristics and child functioning, Beller et al. (unpublished) examined the effects of heterogeneous and homogeneous groupings with respect to age and social class in an infant

day care setting. Significant differences included findings such as homogeneous groupings resulting in children spending more time alone, staring at others and engaging in aimless activity contrasted with the children in heterogeneous environments spending typically more time with each other and specifically more time cooperating with each other. Furthermore, it was found that even when alone, these children tended to spend more time in imaginative role play which may well have positive social and cognitive implications. One again finds differences in terms of the teachers in these various settings with the teachers in heterogeneous environments being more nurturant towards the children and complying more often with the demands of the children than those teachers in the homogeneous age environments. Although the teachers in both environments were in frequent physical contact with the children, only the teachers in the heterogeneous age groups showed more warmth and sensitive attention towards the children's needs and the children from the heterogeneous age groups were seen as more sensitive and responsive to the teachers' needs. The authors speculated that the heterogeneous age groups seemed to reflect a mutually supportive environment in which adults tended to be sensitive and responsive, thereby encouraging the children to be sensitive without the necessity of being intrusive or controlling. The question arises again, however, whether one is measuring here so much the effects of heterogeneity and homogeneity or the possible self-selecting factors at work in terms of teachers with certain types of personalities choosing to work in certain types of settings. Furthermore, there is insufficient information in the Beller report available to us regarding various characteristics of

the children, teacher ratios and other parameters to be truly clear about the meaning and interpretation of these findings.

Having stressed the many components that need to be specified in characterizing day care, and having also emphasized the need to study how these components are interrelated, we return now to our second and third questions: What evidence is there that the quality of parent-child interaction does influence the preschool child's day care experience, and how can the quality of parent-child interaction be influenced to promote the total day care experience of the child?

II. PARENT-CHILD INTERACTION AND THE CHILD'S DAY CARE EXPERIENCE.

Since from the review of research relating to the effects of the day care experience on the preschool child few firm conclusions could be established, and since we had emphasized that we must in further research specify the components of the total day care experience, it is appropriate to ask what components of that experience have perhaps not been given sufficient attention in maximizing the development of the child? Specifically, for this paper, we need to determine which parameters might be subject to influence in any effort to license towards developmental day care.

Various types of data suggest that the child's relationship to the primary caretaker exerts a maximal influence. By three years of age this has resulted in a complex interacting system into which all partners have had an input. Whatever its origin in terms of the relative contribution of child and parent factors, it has now been established that many of the child

variables already discussed in the above section and used to evaluate the impact of day care are correlated at various ages with clusters of parent-child variables (Heinicke, 1977a).

Focusing on the preschool child, Baumrind (1967) has shown that in the middle-class families where the parents exercised consistent control, moved the child towards greater maturity, promoted communication and were also loving, the preschool children were judged to be more socialized, self-controlled, affiliative, self-reliant, self-assertive, realistic, confident, and content. Children in this as opposed to other groups were highest on task orientation factors such as "explores environment actively," "likes to learn new skills," and "perseveres when encounters frustration."

These results were essentially confirmed by Heinicke (1977b) in a study of families on welfare whose preschool children were attending the Culver City Day Care Center. We have already mentioned the cluster of child behaviors labeled "adaptation-competence" which included the following: Task orientation, the Stanford Binet I.Q., the ability to modulate aggression, the capacity for peer relationships, and the ability to make the psychological move from the relationship to their primary caretakers to the relationships in the day care center. Children rated high on this cluster of variables tended to have mothers who were affectionate, made their psychological availability clear, communicated well with their child, set standards for academic achievement, and promoted the child's move toward new relationships and new cognitive experiences.

Studies focusing on the child's development from birth to three years

further document the general proposition that variations in the child's development are closely associated with variations in the profile of parent-child interaction. Research by Yarrow, Pedersen and Rubenstein (1975) and Brody and Axelrad (1970) focus on the first year of life and that by Clarke-Steward (1973) on the second year of life.

While the direction of influence is clearly both from child to parent and from parent to child, it does follow from the above findings that one way to affect the child's development is to attempt among other things to influence the nature of the parent's interaction with the child. The total development of the child including his adaptation to day care is likely to take a more progressive direction if the quality of the family interaction is improved.

Three broad forms of family intervention will be discussed here: Training to promote mother-infant verbal interaction around a cognitively stimulating task, a social work approach to promote the competence of the parent as a person and a parent, and various parent education efforts.

As part of his excellent review: Is Early Intervention Effective? Bronfenbrenner (1974) sets the stage for his own emphasis on family intervention by noting that research on preschool intervention carried out in group settings showed that the children gained in I.Q. and other cognitive measures during the first year of the program, but that during the follow-up period these gains tended to be lost. By contrast, parent-child intervention

involving training of the parent to promote verbal interaction with her child around a cognitively stimulating task resulted in substantial gains in I.Q. which were still evident three to four years after termination of the program (Bronfenbrenner, 1974). The greatest gains were made when the children entered the program as one or two year olds.

In a project developed by Levenstein, a social worker or trained para-professional typically visits the home bi-weekly for a period of months, brings as a gift various Verbal Interaction Stimulus materials, and focuses on developing the mother's competence in interacting verbally with her infant around the use of this material. Merely making a friendly visit or simply providing the stimulating material was not sufficient to produce a major effect. A process of modeling and teaching led to a change in the quality of the mother-infant interrelationship and specifically their verbal interaction around a cognitively stimulating task.

This finding, as well as other studies stress the importance of a longitudinal view. Specifically, how does earlier family intervention affect the child's ability to make use of later educational opportunities? Thus, Bronfenbrenner (1974) concludes from a review of various studies that the type of parent intervention being discussed here, if introduced during and especially prior to the child's enrollment in preschool or school, is likely to lead to greater and more enduring gains in children who are enrolled in group programs once they are in preschool or school.

This finding is of particular relevance to this paper where the focus is on the preschool child. Thus, working with 4 year-olds, Radin (1972)

contrasted three lower class groups attending a preschool program. In one group the home visitor worked only with the child. In the second, the home visitor used similar materials but encouraged mother-child interaction. The third group was the same as the second but in addition experienced weekly group meetings focusing on child-rearing practices. At the end of the year, all three groups had made significant but very similar gains in I.Q. However, only the two groups of children exposed to the enhancement of mother-child interaction showed further gains in I.Q. of 10 to 15 points in kindergarten, and this even though the family intervention was now no longer being offered. Apparently, the changes wrought in the mother-child interaction during the last preschool year (4 - 5) continued to operate positively in facilitating the child's further development. That is, even though it has been shown that the earlier in the life of the child the family intervention is introduced, the greater the gains in cognitive development (Bronfenbrenner, 1974), intervention during the interval being considered in this paper, ages 3 to 5, is also clearly of great value.

Some of the limitations of the method of training to promote mother-child verbal interaction around a cognitively stimulating task must also be pointed out. Follow-up studies by Madden, Levenstein, and Levenstein (1976) have been carried out and include children in third grade. I.Q. differences favoring the treatment groups were sustained in this follow-up. Unfortunately no other indices of child functioning were included and the results were based on a quasi-experimental design. Since use of short-term experimental design did not replicate these findings, judgement on the effectiveness of verbal interaction methods has to be made with caution.

Another set of limitations relates to the characteristics of the mother or other primary caretaker. While the intervention clearly often had a favorable impact on the general confidence and capabilities of the adult and not just on their interaction with their child, many parents clearly do not have the energy or the psychological resources to participate in the enthusiastic involvement with their child around cognitively oriented tasks. Thus, the first task may well be to help the parent deal with their depressed situation. The next family intervention approach to be discussed below accordingly focuses not only on bringing about changes in the parent-child interaction but also attempts to provide social and psychological assistance to the parent as a person.

Turning to another mode of family intervention, Heinicke et al., (1976) and Heinicke (1977b) have evaluated the impact on parents and their 3 to 6 year old day care children of various forms of social work. In all instances, the goal was to enhance the competence of the parent as a person and his or her functioning vis-a-vis their child was discussed in specific detail. Fathers and other primary caretakers were worked with wherever possible. However, the mothers were initially predominantly single, were working in a metropolitan area, and were either on welfare or fell into a low income grouping. Seventy-five percent were white, with five percent black and twenty percent Spanish surname. Although the mothers were frequently isolated and depressed, they did not live in an area of concentrated poverty.

The effects of five different treatment conditions have been studied so far. The first two treatment conditions were used for all families during

the first year of the project and were named: The open-ended interpretive and open-ended supportive approaches. In the open-ended approach, neither area of discussion nor length of contact between parent and social worker were specifically limited. Regular contact tended to be arranged and was maintained throughout the child's stay at the Center. Shortly before the child left the Center (and this typically occurred at the end of kindergarten) the social worker moved towards a meaningful termination with the parent.

In the conceptualization of the open-ended technique, two qualitatively different emphases in the approach to the parent were defined and used -- supportive and interpretive. Within the supportive mode, the goal was to facilitate the autonomous adaptation of the parent through problem-solving, encouragement, and also direct assistance. This could relate to the area of personal functioning, parenting, or both. Within the interpretive modes, the goal was to help the parent understand the nature of his or her experience and to relate those revelations to observed difficulties in their personal functioning and parenting. Both modes were used but early in the intervention, the social worker in consultation with staff decided which mode would predominate for a particular family.

The third treatment condition, the problem-oriented, is not open-ended but focuses on specific problem areas. It was used for all new families in the second year of the project. Even though the parent was encouraged to return as new problems were perceived, the duration of the contacts was limited to the resolution of the problem areas. The contacts were thus not as frequent but a relationship was maintained on the average for the same two year length of time as in the open-ended interventions.

The fourth treatment condition consisted of those families who were offered one of the above forms of help but could not utilize it.

The fifth treatment condition involved the families for whom social work services were not available.

In order to introduce maximum control, the three intervention groups (open-ended interpretive, open-ended supportive, and problem-oriented) and the two non-intervention contrast groups, (treatment not available and treatment offered but not utilized) were constituted on a case-for-case matching basis in such a way that they were equivalent at six weeks after entry on the Stanford Binet I.Q. score, sex, and age of entry into Center. Matching on these child criteria resulted in all other variables including length of contact being matched as well.

Using parent-child and child factor scores as indices of the differential impact of the treatment conditions, it was found that the parents in the open-ended interpretive group as contrasted with the other groups, did have higher scores at 5, 12, and 24 months after entry into day care, on moving the child to new relationships and cognitive experiences. This same group also scored significantly higher on the following: Limit-setting and providing and organized environment at the 5 months assessment point, and affection-giving at both the 12 months and 24 months point. Similarly, their children had significantly higher scores at 5, 12, and 24 months on two of the child factors: The adaptation-competence factor and another loaded on ratings of the child's task orientation in the I.Q. test situation. Examination of the impact of treatment conditions on other indices of parent

functioning supports the conclusion of considerable change.

A new study sample was initiated in the third year of the project. The preschool director was used as extensively as possible in providing direct services to the parents (Heinicke et al., 1976). The social worker consulted with the director but also saw the families in person where further assessment suggested a need for such intervention.

We turn then briefly to another form of family intervention, parent education, which involves the effort to impart knowledge so as to improve various phases of the family's life. Imparting knowledge is to be differentiated from intervention directed at behavior and attitudes as exemplified by the previously cited social work and parent training approaches. While future approaches or future evaluations of parent education may revise present conclusions (and we cannot do complete justice to this issue in this paper), the research to date indicates that this form of family intervention is not effective in altering the development of the children from low-income families. (See the reviews of Kraft and Chilman, 1966, and White et al., 1973.) We conclude that parent education is not likely to provide an effective kind of family intervention addition to enhance the day care child's development.

The above review of the research literature does, however, suggest that the addition of two of the types of family intervention discussed is likely to enhance the development of the day care preschool child. These are: Training to promote the verbal interaction of parent and child around a cognitively challenging task, and specific forms of social work to enhance the

competence of the parent as a person as well as a parent in their interaction with their child. Common to both of these interventions, is the fact that the parent to child interaction is changed in a way that enhances the potential of the child. The question next arises: What type of staff is needed to make such family services available and how can licensing affect such availability.

Social Work Services for Families Provided in the Context of Day Care.

Social work services have, in the past, often been provided as part of the day care experience. We are suggesting that the option of using such services ought to be available to each day care consumer. Specific revisions of the licensing manual might then include a section like:

> Social work services for the parents or primary caretaker that are supportive of their parenting roles as well as their own and their child's individual development should be potentially available as part of the day care services. This program component may take various forms and must be carefully integrated with the planning for child and family done by the day care provider. Furthermore, these considerations are introduced in addition to those regulating parent involvement on such bodies as advisory councils.

Further explanation of the above paragraphs is necessary. Various functions can be defined for the social worker attached to a group day care center.

1. Frequently the social worker joins the director in the intake procedure of gathering information on the family, determining the suitability of the day care service, and helping to plan the best staff and curriculum approach to the child.

2. Some type of ongoing contact with the family is maintained in order to achieve sufficient understanding of family characteristics and needs.

3. Specification of a problem area may be initiated by the family or the day care provider. The social worker may play an important role in further defining this problem.

4. Three different modes of help are possible, provided of course that the family is receptive to participating in such help.

   a. The social worker consults with the director and/or the teachers involved with the family. Wherever possible, the developmental and other issues are dealt with by the center staff.

   b. The nature of the problem may be such that direct intervention by the social worker is most efficient. It is in this regard that we would recommend the particular family intervention approaches discussed above. Manuals describing these approaches as well as training possibilities would have to be available. Moreover, we anticipate that other methods of family and parent intervention will be developed in the near future.

c. The nature of the problem may be such that referral to community resources is most appropriate. For example, referral to a community mental health center has, in our experience, often been necessary to deal with a more distressed parent or child.

It may be asked that if the child's relationship to the primary caretaker is of such importance, why not approach this problem directly as has been done, and why concern oneself with using the day care of the child as a vehicle for introducing this intervention. The reasoning in this regard is that since one is often dealing with families who are not easily accessible, their search for day care, "a good safe place to keep my child while I work," may often be the most convenient and perhaps only way of providing that access. Given the mother's or primary caretaker's involvement in her child's care and given considerable trust in the staff taking care of her child, our experience suggests that she becomes accessible to and can cooperate with efforts to help her improve her family functioning. This does not contradict the importance of the availability of mental health and development services in other settings and at other times. Intervention is not a once and for all matter, nor are social services something that one can require the family to use. What we are stressing is that day care often provides a unique opportunity to assist a family. Mindful of the dangers of intrusion, the observation possibilities of the day care center allow the parents to see certain problems and recognize the need for assistance in a manner that is simply not going to occur if they have to use a model of defining a problem, selecting services,

and making appointments to use that service.

In family day care, this process of facilitating family social services is clearly more difficult. Where there is ongoing contact or at least potential contact with the family day care giver, this resource could be used to facilitate family intervention. Below we examine the various forms of service delivery that could be used.

Emlen (1973) has argued that the need is not necessarily for more group day care but for finding ways of enhancing the quality of the naturally occurring family day care through consultation and supportive services. We have previously suggested (Heinicke, 1973) and are again suggesting, that the selective use of family intervention should be one of these support services.

Emlen and his colleagues have used social work consultants to support a naturally occurring event which they have labelled the Day Care Neighbor Service. The Day Care Neighbor is an individual who is already informally helping her neighbors make day care arrangements. The social work consultant assists these key individuals to recruit more and better day care givers in the neighborhood, to match givers and users who will be compatible and helpful to the children, and to maintain good arrangements which might otherwise terminate (Emlen and Watson, 1971; Collins and Watson, 1976). If in this process the social work consultant and the day care neighbor could facilitate the direct services to the families, not only are the families likely to benefit, but the day care arrangements are themselves likely to be more stable. Heinicke (1976) has shown that the addition of the social work family intervention

to the ongoing day care preschool program, greatly lengthens the stay of a family in that particular day care center; i.e., there is a significant decrease in the dropout rate.

Other models of contact with family day care provide similar opportunities for the delivery of family intervention services. As part of the U.C.L.A. Child Care services, educational professionals hired by the University arrange, support and monitor certain family day care givers to whom student families are referred (Cochran, M., 1976). The family day care giver could be helped by these educators to identify those families most likely to benefit from social and developmental resources. It is important to stress that this process is not conceived in the usual referral for problems-patient-pathology sense, but as promoting the development of those parents and children who could make better use of their potential.

Those professionals involved in licensing family day care homes, could also be the first step of a process that leads to the delivery of family-oriented supportive services. If indeed these licensing professionals could at least facilitate the availability of such resources, and if, as we have proposed, facilitating such contacts were a part of the family day care givers' obligation in order to meet license requirements, then the process of licensing would become much more meaningful. Given this development, we would anticipate that a larger and larger proportion of the family day care givers would want to have a license. Clearly, their job of day care would be eased if those families who need support would indeed be receiving it. While the

National Child Care Consumer Study (1976) indicates that the users of family day care are not as receptive to regulation of this as opposed to center care, and specifically in reply to questions, only 26% of the users wanted regulation to provide counseling services, our experience in providing social work supportive services to employed single mothers encourages us to believe that once these users have experienced this type of support, word passes around and the interest and trust increase greatly.

III. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

This paper addresses the question of what aspects of the day care experience of the preschooler can possibly be changed through licensing revisions in order to improve the developmental potential of the child and his or her family. We have broken down our approach to this question into three further broad areas of discussion.

In the first section we examined the research literature in terms of the question of what effects does the typical day care experience have on the immediate and long-term development of the preschool child and family. We concluded that the evidence on the long-term effects of day care is practically non-existent, and such adequate studies of the short-term effects as exist, do not indicate an overwhelming documentation of either a positive or negative effect. Using certain important child development variables as headings around which to organize the findings on the short-term effect, day care did not seem to make an appreciable impact on the development of I.Q. As with all findings, the methodological difficulties were such that any

conclusion must be made very cautiously. Several studies did report that children who had been in day care prior to the age of 3, exhibited a higher level of peer interaction when entering a different day care center than those children who were without prior day care experience. These same children, showing a greater social ease and who had been in day care since 9 months, exceeded their previously home-reared counterparts in aggression, both physical and verbal, whether towards peers or adults. They were also less cooperative in relation to grown-ups and engaged in more running about as against sitting in one place. It is suggested therefore, that the same children who showed greater ease in relating to peers also showed a poorer task orientation and poorer modulation of aggression. These conclusions are supported by several studies but as indicated in the text of the paper, these studies also contain serious methodological problems.

Still other findings relate to the child's transition from the relationship to the primary caretaker to new relationships in the day care center. The study by Blehar (1974) does indicate that children in day care when contrasted with those living at home, did have greater difficulty in making a transition from the primary caretaker to the strange adult. Once more, there are serious criticisms that can be made of the methodology of this study, but taken together with the findings of the previously mentioned research, we do conclude that the study of the impact of the day care experience on such developmental variables as task orientation, modulation of aggression, and the ability to make the transition from the primary caretaker to new relationships, is definitely worthy of further specific study.

In pursuing such further research, it was stressed that the day care experience not be viewed as some homogenous and unitary phenomena, but that the various type of day care situations be carefully described in terms of the various components making up that setting. The components that have been previously studied are the physical arrangements, the staff to child ratio, the nature of the parent participation, the nature of the "curriculum," the type of age-grouping, whether the day care structure is open or closed, and the personalities and experience of the director and teachers. It was further stressed that in evaluating a particular component, it is necessary to study the interaction of that component with the other components. Thus, variations in the impact of different age groupings may be as much a function of the type of teacher who uses a particular age grouping as the age-grouping itself.

In searching further for those components of the total day care experience that might well have a significant impact on the child and the family, we concentrated on the nature of the family functioning and asked how does the quality of the parent-child interaction influence the preschool child's day-care experience, and what in turn can be done to promote the quality of that parent-child interaction?

We, first of all, reviewed some of the research indicating the influence of parent on child and child on parent. We reasoned further that one way to affect the child's development in day care is to attempt, among other things, to influence the nature of the parent's interaction with the child. The total development of the child, including his adaptation to day care,

is likely to take a more progressive direction if the quality of the family interaction is improved. Three broad forms of family intervention were discussed: Training to promote mother-infant verbal interaction around a cognitively stimulating task, a social work approach to promote the competence of the parent as a person and a parent, and various parent education efforts. Evidence was cited that the first two of these approaches was indeed effective with the pre-school child. While other forms of intervention could be used, a review of the literature including a previous review by Bronfenbrenner (1974), led us to focus on these two types of intervention as salient examples.

In addressing the issue of the delivery of services, we once more broadened the focus somewhat by speaking about social work services for families provided in the context of day care. As a possible addition to licensing guidelines, it was suggested that: Social work services for the parents or primary caretaker that are supportive of their parenting roles as well as their own and their child's individual development, should be potentially available as part of the day care services. This program component may take various forms and should be carefully integrated with the planning for the child and family done by the day care provider. Furthermore, these considerations are introduced in addition to those regulating parent involvement on such bodies as advisory counself.

Four functions of such a social worker attached to a day care service were outlined:

1. Joining the director in the intake procedure of gathering information on the family, determining the suitability of the day care service, and helping to plan the best curriculum approach to the child.

2. Maintaining some type of ongoing contact with the family in order to achieve sufficient understanding of its characteristics and needs.

3. Specification of a problem area which is either initiated by the family or the day care provider.

4. Provision of help along three broad lines, which were defined as consultation with the day care provider, direct intervention by the social worker, and/or referral to community resources. While the above applies to both the center and family-type of day care, the particular problems of providing family social work services in the context of family day care, were also discussed and certain suggestions were made.

Finally, without wishing to minimize the importance of providing social work and developmental services on a general community basis, it was nevertheless stressed that the use of such services in connection with the provision of day care is not only efficient, especially if it can be done so to speak on the spot, but does provide a unique opportunity for providing assistance to families and children that might otherwise be unaware and/or unable to make use

of facilitating services. We did, however, also stress the importance of maintaining the family's option to use such services as opposed to requiring them as part of the delivery of day care.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAUMRIND, D. Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1967, 75, 43-89.

BELLER, E. K., LITWAH, E., SULLIVAN, K. An observational study of interaction in day care (unpublished).

BLEHAR, M. C. Anxious attachment and defensive reactions associated with day care. Child Development, 1974, 45, 683-692.

BRODY, S. & AXELRAD, S. Anxiety and ego formation in infancy. New York International Universities Press, 1970.

BRONFENBRENNER, U. Is early intervention effective? DHEW Publication, No. (OHD) 74-25, 1974.

CALDWELL, B. M. Statement prepared for select subcommittee on education and labor, United States House of Representatives, 1969.

CALDWELL, B. M., WRIGHT, C. M., HONIG, A. S., TANNENBAUM, J. Infant care and attachment. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1970, 40, 397-412.

CISIN, J. A Group Day Care Program for Culterally Deprived Children and Parents. The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. Progress Report, Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970.

CLARKE-STEWART, A. K. Interactions between mothers and their young children: Characteristics and consequences. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1973, Serial No. 153, 38, 6-7.

COCHRAN, M. . A comparison of group day care and family child rearing patterns in Sweden. Ithaca, New York: Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Cornell University. Unpublished report, 1974.

COCHRAN, M. The training and developmental process of family day care persons, presented within the process of the development of UCLA Family Day Care Service. On record at Pacific Oaks College, Pasadena, Calif. Unpublished thesis, 1976.

COLLINS, A. H. & WATSON, E. L. Family Day Care, 1976, Boston, Beacon Press.

COYLE, D. R. A study of the effects on intellectual and perceptual development of children in all-day care. ERIC #ED 094 855, 1974.

EMLEN, A. C. & WATSON, E. L. Matchmaking in Neighborhood Day Care, Corvalis, Oregon: Continuing Education Publications, 1971.

EMLEN, A. C., Slogans, slots, and slander: The myth of day care need. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1973, 43(1), 23-36.

FEATHERSTONE, H. Cognitive effects of preschool programs on different types of children. ERIC #ED 082 238, 1973.

FOWLER, W. & KHAN, N. The Later Effects of Infant Group Care: A follow up Study. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1974.

HEINICKE, C. M. Some effects of separating two-year-old children from their parents: A comparative study. Human Relations, 1956, 9, 105-176.

HEINICKE, C. M., BUSCH, F., CLICK, P., & KRAMER, E. Parent-child relations, adaptation to nursery school and the child's task orientation: A contrast in the development of two girls, 1973. In J. C. Westman (Ed.) In J. C. Westman (Ed.) Individual Differences in Children, Wiley Intersciences.

HEINICKE, C. M., FRIEDMAN, D., PRESCOTT, E., PUNCEL, C., & SALE, J. The organization of day care: Considerations relating to the mental health of child and family. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1973, 43, 8-22.

HEINICKE, C. M., STRASSMANN, L. H., GIVEN, K., STRATHY, E., RAMSEY-KLEE, D., SPINGATH, T., FARLEY, A., WOODSON, L., & LAMPL, E. Change in Parent and Child: Aiding at Risk Children Through Psychoanalytic Social Work with their Parents. Preliminary Final Report, O.C.D. Grant #48, 1976. Unpublished manuscript.

HEINICKE, C. M. Aiding "at risk" children through psychoanalytic social work with parents. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1976, 46, 89-103.

HEINICKE, C. M. Towards a strategy of early intervention: The correlates and continuity of task orientation. Submitted for publication to the American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1977a.

HEINICKE, C. M. Changes in the preschool child as a function of change in the parent-child relationship. Presented at the 1977 Society for Research in Child Development Meetings, 1977b.

KAGAN, J., KEARSLEY, R. B., & ZELAZO, P. R. The effects of infant day care on psychological development, 1976. Unpublished manuscript.

KEISTER, M. E. Can infants thrive in group care? The Woman Physician, 1971, 26, 141-149.

KRAFT, I. & CHILMAN, C. S. Helping Low Income Families Through Parent Education. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Children's Bureau, 1966.

LALLY, R., LINDSTROM, D., MEYER, W., & LAY, M. Intellectual Characteristics of Children with Day Care Experience from Six Months through Three Years. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Children's Center, 1971.

MADDEN, J., LEVENSTEIN, P., & LEVENSTEIN, S. Longitudinal I.Q. outcomes of the mother-child program. Child Development, 1976, 47, 1015-1025.

MANUAL, Guides for Day Care Licensing, 1976, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, O.C.D., Washington, D.C.

MOORE, T. Children of full-time and part-time mothers. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 1964, 2, 1-10.

PRENTISS, M., BIERI, J. Intellectual development of culturally deprived children in a day care program: A follow-up study. ERIC #ED 045 186, 1970.

PRESCOTT, E., JONES, E., KRITCHEVSKY, S., MILICH, C., HASELHOEF, E. Who thrives in day care? Part 2 of final report entitled: Assessment of Child Rearing Environments: An Ecological Approach (prepared for the Children's Bureau, O.C.D., 1973).

RADIN, N. Three degrees of maternal involvement in a preschool program: Impact on mothers and children. Child Development, 1972, 43, 1355-1364.

RAPH, J. B., THOMAS, A., CHESS, S., & CORN, S. J. The influence of nursery school on social interactions. Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1968, 38, 144-152.

ROBINSON, B. & ROBINSON, N. M. Longitudinal development of very young children in a comprehensive day care program: The first two years. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1673-1683.

SCHWARTZ, J. C. & WYNN, R. The effects of mothers' presence and previsits on children's emotional reaction to starting nursery school. Child Development, 1971, 42, 871-881.

SCHWARTZ, J. C., KROLICK, G., & STRICKLAND, R. G. Effects of early day care experience on adjustment to a new environment. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1973, 43, 340-346.

SCHWARTZ, J. C., STRICKLAND, R. G., & KROLICK, G. Infant day care: Behavioral effects at preschool age. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 520-506.

STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS from the National Child Consumer Study. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Human Development, 1976.

WHITE, S. H., DAY, M. C., FREEMAN, P. K., HANTMAN, S. A., & MESSENGER, K. P. Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations. Vol. I - III. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 1973.

YARROW, L. J., RUBENSTEIN, J. L., & PEDERSEN, F. A. Infant and Environment: Early Cognitive and Motivational Development. Halsted Press, Washington, 1975.

NOTE TO THE READER:

The interpretations and conclusions expressed in this paper are the author's and are not intended to represent the position or policy of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

It is being distributed to solicit comments and criticisms to assure technical soundness, the adequacy of supporting materials, relevance, and general comprehensibility. It is hoped that this paper and its review will contribute to the improvement of the public debate on social policy and the proper Federal role in regulating child day care.

Comments may be addressed to:

William R. Prosser
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
OS/ASPE/SSHD - 416E South Portal Building
200 Independence Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20201